

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In an Office Action mailed November 21, 2006, the Examiner:

- A. Rejected claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claim is directed to nonstatutory subject matter;
- B. Rejected claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention; and
- C. Allowed claims 37-42 and 51.

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 37-42 and 51-53.

Applicants' attorney thanks the Examiner for his discussion of the following remarks in a telephone interview on February 15, 2007. No agreement was reached in that interview, but the Examiner agreed to review these remarks in more detail.

REMARKS

A. Rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claim is directed to nonstatutory subject matter;

In the Office Action mailed November 21, 2006, the Examiner states:

A program is not one of the four patentable subject matters. The defect can be remedied by deleting the first line of claim 52.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's analysis, for the following reason.

Claim 52 is not claiming a computer program per se. Rather, claim 52 is claiming a product, namely a computer readable storage medium that includes a computer program mechanism embedded therein. Such a product is an article of manufacture, which is one of the four patentable subject matters.

Nevertheless, to eliminate any confusion caused by the language of the preamble, based on the Examiner's suggestion, the preamble has been changed from "A computer program product, comprising" to "A product, comprising." Clearly, this change in the preamble does not change the scope of the claim because neither preamble constitutes a claim limitation.

B. Rejection of claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention

In the Office Action mailed November 21, 2006, the Examiner states:

The preamble calls for a graphical user interface. However, there is nothing graphical user interface recited in the claim combination nor disclosed in the specification. It appears that Applicants' disclosed invention is not a graphical user interface.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's analysis, for the following reasons.

First, the recited combination of elements in claim 53 does contain graphical user interface elements, including an email thread, a plurality of simultaneously provided reply mechanisms, and a reply form.

Second, the Applicants' disclosed invention includes a graphical user interface. For example, the Summary of the Invention at paragraph [0013] expressly states:

In one embodiment, a reply form may be provided as an interface to respond to an email message. (emphasis added)

Similarly, the specification at paragraph [0032] expressly states:

FIG. 2A illustrates an exemplary reply form 200 according to one embodiment of the invention. Reply form 200 may provide an interface for the user to respond to a previously received email message 210. (emphasis added)

Most importantly, Figure 6A shows an exemplary graphical user interface that corresponds to claim 53, including an email thread 500, a plurality of simultaneously provided reply mechanisms (e.g., the two "Reply" links), and a reply form 200.

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's analysis, a graphical user interface is indeed recited in claim 53 and supported by the specification. Moreover, claim 53 has a clear scope that points out and distinctly claims the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention.

C. Allowance of claims 37-42 and 51

Thank you.


CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn and claims 37-42 and 51-53 be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner believes a discussion of the above would be useful, he is invited to call the Applicant's attorney, Dr. Robert Beyers, at (650) 843-7528.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 15, 2007


Robert B. Beyers, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46,552

MORGAN LEWIS
2 Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700
Palo Alto, CA 94306